DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 275 143 FL 016 041

AUTHOR Flanigan, Beverly Olson
TITLE Bilingual Education for Native Americans: The Argument From Studies of Variational English.
SPONS AGENCY Ohio Univ., Athens.
PUB DATE Mar 83
GRANT 6650-21000-3660
NOTE 14p.; In: Handscombe, Jean, Ed.; And Others. On TESOL '83. The Question of Control. Selected Papers from the Annual Convention of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (17th, Toronto, Canada, March 15-20, 1983); see FL 015 035.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Information Analyses (070) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS American Indian Languages; *American Indians; *Bilingual Education; Dialect Studies; Educational Needs; *English (Second Language); Federal Programs; *Language Maintenance; *Language Variation; Nonstandard Dialects; Second Language Instruction; *Standard Spoken Usage; Uncommonly Taught Languages
IDENTIFIERS *Lakota (Language)

ABSTRACT

This paper examines the relevant literature on American Indian dialectal variations of English and efforts to maintain American Indian languages through bilingual education programs. The preservation of the ancestral Lakota dialect of the Siouan language is discussed in terms of the implications for educational program planning. It is concluded that many existing programs classified as bilingual are really transition programs providing only a brief daily exposure to the native language. In addition, the English spoken on the reservations is frequently a nonstandard variety that has been analyzed and validated as an old and continuing dialectal form. It is suggested that in light of this information, instruction in Standard English as a Second Dialect combined with native history and culture courses might become the program of first choice for many schools. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☤ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. FRANK McNeil

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED275143

FL 016 041

Bilingual Education for Native Americans: The Argument From Studies of Variational English

Beverly Olson Flanigan

In the past decade a number of studies have been made of the distinctive varieties of American Indian English purportedly used throughout the United States. To date, some fifteen such studies have appeared, including analyses of Navajo "Dormitory English" (Harvey 1974), Isletan Tiwa English (Leap 1973, 1974), and the English of the Cheyenne (Alford 1974), the Mojave (Penfield 1975), the Yakima (Weeks 1975), the Pima (Miller 1977), and the Mescalero (Dubois 1978), to name just a few. The assumption underlying most of these studies has been that each such variational English is the result of interference from the ancestral language of the tribal group; hence the number of Indian English varieties is potentially 200 or so, the number of Native American languages still spoken on the continent (Leap 1978). Combined with the transfer of Native language features, including syntactic and phonological forms as well as semantic and pragmatic conventions, has been the presumably incomplete and imperfect learning of standard English in the schools and in the workplace by generations of semi-isolated and semi-educated Indians. Thus speakers commit developmental errors of various sorts, just as child language learners and second or foreign language learners do in the course of acquiring full language proficiency. (See, for example, Brown 1973 on first language acquisition and Taylor 1975 and Richards 1971 on ESL/EFL production errors.) The implication of both assumptions is that educational intervention and the passage of time can effect the eradication of such errors.

What cannot be ignored, however, is the fact that the speakers of these dialectal varieties are, for the most part, neither child learners nor speakers of foreign tongues

---

Beverly Olson Flanigan is Assistant Professor of Linguistics at Ohio University in Athens where she teaches courses in second language acquisition, sociolinguistics, and bilingualism. Her dissertation, from Indiana University, was on American Indian varieties of English.

[1]Research for this study was concluded during the summer of 1982 with the aid of an Ohio University Research Grant (No. 665:0-21000-3660), and I gratefully acknowledge its support.

suddenly set down in an English-speaking environment. English is in fact the first language of a rapidly increasing number of Native Americans, and it is for many more the dominant language of use if not the initially acquired tongue. Indeed, knowledge of native Indian languages is fading so rapidly that it has been estimated that at least one such language is disappearing each year (Potter 1981); Saville-Troike (1978) states that 49 languages have fewer than ten speakers each. What this means is that many of the native tongues are increasingly used only by members of the older generation, comprehended, in varying degrees, by their children, and neither used nor understood by their grandchildren. Thus the English spoken on many reservations today is an English handed down for four or five generations and learned as a social and/or geographical variety by each successive group of children in much the same way that child-language learners everywhere acquire particular varieties of English.

The source of these particular varieties of English may be debated; in a paper read at the annual conference on New Ways of Analyzing Variation in English (NWAVE XI) in October 1982, I presented evidence refuting the interference hypothesis in the case of one such variety, Lakota English. Other researchers have noted similarities across Native American Englishes which cannot be explained by ancestral family relatedness, typological relatedness, or even areal diffusion of forms but which do bear a remarkable likeness to the *non-mainstream* varieties of English spoken by other cultural groups in the United States, including Black, Chicano, and nonstandard white varieties. Wolfram (1980) has found similarities in the incidence of consonant cluster reduction, unmarked tense, and negative concord across such nonstandard varieties, and Stout (1977) has observed variability in the use of *do*, *be*, and the modal auxiliaries among Cheyenne, Isletan, and Laguna speakers of English that parallels their use in other nonstandard English dialects. In fact, those who a decade ago were arguing most strongly in favor of unique interference from the native languages are now proposing a *universal* or *natural language* pattern of grammatical simplification and phonological reduction that reflects recent attempts to see early Indian-English contact as similar to other language contact situations in which a simplified language variety was developed which gave rise in turn to a post-pidgin or post-creole continuum of variational forms in much the same way that Spanish, West African, and other languages in contact with English have produced such varieties (Flanigan 1981; cf. Leap and Stout 1976 on *universal* patterns in Isletan Tiwa English). Such studies obviously have their genesis in pidgin-creole research like that of Bickerton (1975) on Guyanese Creole, Reinecke (1969) on Hawaiian Creole, Hancock (1977) on West African Pidgin English, and Blansitt and Teschner (1980) on Hispanic English.

THE NEED FOR BILINGUAL EDUCATION

Regardless of the source, however, present-day Indian speakers of nonstandard varieties are keenly aware of their "broken" or "bad" English, and younger peopel are especially cognizant of the necessity of acquiring the standard code if they are to advance economically and politically in the white man's world. High school and college students are receptive to recently inaugurated courses in Standard English as a Second Dialect, and teachers are eager for help in dealing with the problems of their learners, especially in reading and writing (cf. Harvey 1974, Wolfram et al. 1979, Cronnell 1981, and Allen 1982). Ironically, however, American Indians are at the

same time increasingly anxious to revitalize and maintain their ancestral languages, with the help of second language and bilingual education programs in the schools wherever feasible. The clash between these two keenly felt impulses is neither necessary nor inevitable; Fishman has pointed out that ethnic community mother tongue schools tend to increase when their speakers begin to "interact significantly with the American mainstream"; Hispanics, and now American Indians, are reaching that point of interaction and self-consciousness, and they are demanding that the schools serve them as "authentic channels of biculturism" (Fishman 1980:11f.).

The rub, of course, lies in the fact of ever-diminishing funding for bilingual education, much less for second language instruction of any kind, and particularly in the fact of decreasing support for the inclusion of American Indians in any sort of funding, presumably on the grounds that they, like the children of the Chinese community in the San Francisco case of Lau vs. Nichols, should have learned standard English by now. Leap (personal communication) has pointed out the danger of the elimination of Section 703 (a) (1) (C), the so-called *Indian English* clause of the Bilingual Education Act (popularly called Title VII)—a danger of particularly pointed irony in light of the fact that it was only five short years ago that the act was revised to allow Indians greater access to funding on the basis of the newly defined *Limited English Proficiency* (LEP) criterion than they had had under the earlier *Limited English Speaking Ability* (LESA) requirement. In other words, the revised clause recognized the fact that, while Native languages may no longer be *dominant* in terms of actual use, they may have had, or still have, a *significant impact* on the English language proficiency of Native Americans (Public Law 95-561), whether directly through interference or indirectly through a reduced or simplified code handed down through generations of limited-English-proficient speakers. Now the open hand is threatening to close again.

The objection to continued funding stems, of course, from the increasingly documentable fact that monies are being used primarily to maintain languages other than English and only secondarily (and in some cases hardly at all) to "improve [the] English language skills" of the children and to promote transition to English-only instruction—the express goals of the legislation. If this seems devious (and one school official on the Pine Ridge reservation told me he was quite aware that he was being devious but that he cared not at all whether English language skills were improved or not so long as even some Lakota was learned), the response must be made that even such a reversal of the mandated goals is justifiable on the basis of continued evidence of the improvement of second language skills (in this case English) as well as of general cognitive/academic skills even when primary language (in this case ancestral language) instruction and use remain dominant throughout the early grades of school (cf. Cummins 1980, Troike 1978, Rosier and Farella 1976, and Matthews 1976). English language skills are being improved even as Lakota or Navajo or Crow is also learned; whether it is the standard or educated or *mainstream* variety of English that is being learned is another matter, and one that will be held in abeyance for later discussion. In any case, the fact remains that for a sizable number of Indian children English is still the language of school and not of the home, even if that number is rapidly decreasing, and as long as these children are in the classroom the continuance of bilingual programs for Native Americans is surely warranted.

It is all the more urgent, therefore, to document the continued influence of nonstandard English codes, regardless of historical source, upon the level of English proficiency of Indian children, first of all to insure the continuation of Standard

English as a Second Dialect instruction (an important part of most Title VII programs, whether under that rubric or as pull-out ESL instruction) and secondly to foster the maintenance, and in some cases the revitalization, of Native languages in communities where such support offers the only means by which the schools can afford to initiate instruction in the ancestral language and, where desired, to develop the materials necessary for teaching literacy in that language.

NONSTANDARD ENGLISH AMONG THE LAKOTA

My own preliminary survey of Sioux reservation schools in South Dakota in 1982 has led me to believe that there exists a clear need to recognize the pervasive use of a nonstandard variety of English, particularly among older and middle generation speakers but also among younger school-age children and college students. As I have indicated in more detail elsewhere (Flanigan 1982), this variety bears little evidence of direct interference from the ancestral Lakota dialect of the Siouan language spoken throughout the area, but considerable variation in its syntactic and morphophonemic patterns justifies its consideration as a nonstandard dialect called Lakota English. Thus, while a rapidly diminishing number of Lakota Sioux speak Lakota (contrary to the findings of Wax, Wax, and Dumont less than 20 years ago [1964]), the use of Lakota English is widespread and recognized, even by its users, who still term it Reservation, or "Res," English. The marks of this dialect can be seen in the attestations reproduced in the appendix, collected for the most part from interviews with teachers, bilingual aides, and other school officials on the Pine Ridge and Rosebud reservations in South Dakota. Selected examples might be cited here under three heads:

Phonological:

a. Variable substitution of the interdental stop /t, d/ for the fricative (th): "tings dat dose kids should know about"; "On'y ting different among us in dis Sou' Dakota bands. . . ."

b. Substitution of the verbal suffix /In/ for /iŋ/: "Gettin' back to this Indian education"; "we're tryin' to teach Lakota."

c. Reduction of final and medial consonant clusters: "When I firs' start' workin' here"; "Da gues' sit over dere."

d. Schwa-intrusion (possibly transferred from Lakota, where it is common): "Og(ə)lala," "Eng(ə)lish," "moder(ə)n," "pic(ə)ture."

e. Loss of palatalization: "Ind'an," "carr' on " [carry on].

Morphological:

a. Lack of subject-verb agreement: "My brother, he do that every day"; "I was teaching the bigger ones that knows how to read and write."

b. Variable inflection for person and number: "There's two way of talkin'"; "One of that word is . . ."; "This is all mix-blood childrens."

c. Lack of referential agreement: "They don't have this modern sound systems"; "We have most of the things . . . we made it right here."

d. Variable tense and aspect marking: "I had enough of that when I hafta teach in the whole school"; "Our childrens are start . . . really mixing up"; "He got kill here."

e. Variable gender and case marking: "Tell him [her] to get over here"; "He [she] can cash it"; "Me is here."

Syntactic/discursive:

a. Deletion of function words: "You wanna go bathroom?" "They live New York"; "He go town—he make fire cook."

b. Absence of copula or use of invariant *be*: "This my grandpa"; So that's where we goin'"; "They be goin' home"; "This room too small."

c. Multiple negation: "We don't have no air conditioning"; "A boy who doesn't know nothin'."

d. Inverted word order: "Is that how old is he?" "What's he doing there is, he announcing."

e. Topic/comment construction: "What you read, you must try to remember what you've read." "English person, they don't know guttural." (This last is a pervasive discourse feature which may be transferred from Lakota patterns of narration, as one Native teacher explained to his class: "I wonder which language is reversed, the English or the Lakota? Our words are always, the subject [i.e., topic] always comes first.")

It is clear that, with the few exceptions noted, these dialectal features are not unlike those observed, in greater or lesser frequency, in other nonstandard varieties of American English, including Black English Vernacular, Appalachian English, Chicano English, and others. What is most interesting about these samples is their source; spoken mainly by adults, and even by teachers, they bear witness to the widespread use of the nonstandard variety across age groups and even across socioeconomic levels (although the latter term is less than fully distinctive on the reservations, where 85% unemployment is common). Moreover, while one might predict a decreased use of such forms among the school-age generation because of the influence of the mass media as well as the increased presence of non-Indian children in the schools, especially in border areas and in non-reservation urban centers like Rapid City and Pierre and Sioux Falls, samples of both speaking and writing collected by non-Indian teachers in the high schools and colleges on both Pine Ridge and Rosebud reveal the same features to be present to a marked degree, often to the point of causing a virtual breakdown in communication, particularly on the spoken level, between the novice teacher and his or her pupils. The collectors of these samples are convinced both of the need for instruction in Standard English as a Second Dialect and of the desirability of hiring resident linguists (or linguist-educators) to serve as advisers and curriculum developers in the schools (cf. Noll 1980 and Smith 1981). Regardless of whether ESL pull-out classes or English-only instruction is used, they are concerned that without such assistance their students are doomed to less than successful competition in the off-reservation society which increasing numbers of them will enter.

Several predominantly Indian communities have instituted Lakota-English bilingual education programs under one aegis or another, and particularly since the change in terminology from LESA to LEP opened up Title VII funds to schools of primarily English-only children; in addition, the liberalization of the definition of bilingual-bicultural education to include pull-out ESL and native language instruction has allowed readier access to such funds. In 1975–76 only one school in the country offered Lakota and English bilingual instruction (Loneman Day School in Oglala, S.D.); at present, schools all across the state of South Dakota have some sort of bilingual-bicultural program, either under Title VII or, increasingly, under Title IV (Indian Studies) auspices, which are deemed easier to get than are budget-constricted Title VII monies. In addition, Title I programs for math and reading

remediation allow for some use of bilingual instruction. In the remainder of this article, I would like briefly to survey a few of these programs, pointing out common problems and some innovative approaches in three areas of concern to bilingual educators: amount of time spent in native language instruction and use in the classroom; teacher preparation and proficiency; and the issue of maintenance vs. transition in the programs.[2]

NATIVE LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION AND USE

The oldest federally run boarding school in the country, the Indian High School at Flandreau, S.D., has over 40 tribal language groups represented from eight to ten states yet currently offers no Indian language instruction except on an occasional and ad hoc basis; moreover, it offers no special English language tutoring, even though the principal acknowledged that many of the students, particularly the Crow, are weak in standard English skills. In contrast, at least two reservation schools require from 30 to 45 minutes of instruction per day through the medium of Lakota in grades K-3; one added grade 4 last year, and the other is adding grades 4–6 this year. While this may seem to be precious little time, considering the fact that 30–40% of the children in both schools speak Lakota in some form at home, it is time spent on regular content, randomly determined by regular classroom teachers throughout the day. In addition, Loneman School provides Lakota as a Second Language instruction daily for seventh and eighth graders; the teacher, the most highly skilled classroom instructor I observed in my visits, code-switches between Lakota and English randomly both in the Lakota class and throughout the rest of the day, even during mathematics and English language arts classes.

Somewhat less ambitiously, two well known, originally mission schools in the state operate extensive Indian Studies programs, with Lakota as a Second Language classes taught throughout grades 1–8 but within designated class periods only. St. Francis School, formerly Jesuit-run but now a contract school (i.e., granted local control by the Bureau of Indian Affairs), continues Lakota classes throughout high school as well. Red Cloud Indian School, still mission-operated, offers at the other end of the spectrum a most imaginative Montessori program in Lakota Arts, conducted by a veteran male teacher from a highly respected reservation family—not an unwise way to gain the interest and respect of non-Lakota speaking four- and five-year-olds. However, despite efforts at both schools to *go immersion*, that is, to use only Lakota during the half hour or hour spent in Lakota Studies each day, and despite a plethora of beautifully produced and illustrated readers and workbooks at both schools, the time spent is clearly not enough to offset the encroachment of

[2]I wish to express my gratitude to the many teachers, administrators, and members of the Pine Ridge and Rosebud communities who contributed information and materials so generously during my visit to South Dakota, among them Wayne Johnson of the Flandreau Indian School; Maurice Twiss and Levi Left Hand of the Shannon County schools; Collins Jordon, Angeline Rabbit, Linda Henry, Albert White Hat, and Chris and Nellie Eagle Thunder of St. Francis; Matthew Two Bulls, Leo American Horse, Hildegarde Catches, and Fr. Paul Manhart of the Red Cloud Indian School; Duane Ross and Jerry Dearly of Loneman school; Vivian One Feather and Tom Vocu of Wolf Creek school; Bill Noll, Birgil Kills Straight, and Shirley Murphy of Little Wound school; Jeanne Smith and Warfield Moose of Oglala Sioux Community College; Ilene Iron Cloud of the Rapid City schools; Kay Farmer, Nancy Smith, and Sr. Irene Demarius of Sisseton; and Mrs. Elsie Cavender of Granite Falls, Minnesota. Steve and Rose Chesarek of Billings, Montana made helpful comments and alerted me to studies of Crow-English bilingual programs following the initial presentation of this paper at the annual TESOL convention in Toronto in March 1983.

English or to deeply engage the children's interest in language study in a way that might have carryover value to the improvement of their English skills; neither Lakota nor English is demonstrably advanced by the program at either school, and the teachers readily admit this.[3]

Somewhere midway between these two approaches is that of the state-run public schools. At Rapid City, for example, two elementary, one junior high school, and one senior high school offer LSL and ESL instruction, with eight computers and six teacher-aides to help. The Shannon County School at Batesland, on the Pine Ridge border, teaches Lakota two days a week to classes consisting of roughly half Indians and half whites; it has developed an extensive battery of tests in both Lakota and English which is being used by reservation schools at Pine Ridge and Rosebud as well. The final category of programs is that offered on an after-school-hours basis in various public schools with funding under the Johnson O'Malley Act of 1934; typical is the program operated on the Sisseton reservation, where of 85 local teachers only two are Indian and where only 30 children in grades 1-8 have been induced to attend after-school Dakota classes. (The public school at Granite Falls, Minnesota also operates an after-school instructional program in the Dakota, or Santee, dialect.)

TEACHER PREPARATION AND PROFICIENCY

The common thread running through all my conversations with teachers themselves was the lack of adequate teacher training in the techniques and methodology of Native language and culture instruction. Many of the regular teachers were drafted into their jobs because of native speaking proficiency only; in contrast, most of the aides were college students in teacher training programs (for either the Associate of Arts or the B.A. degree) hired to assist non-Lakota teachers, and they knew little Lakota and were particularly weak in literacy skills. Thus while aides were supposedly reinforcing English instruction by rephrasing content material in Lakota from time to time, they were hardly able to more than mouth choppy phrases in a pidgin Lakota. A veteran native teacher commented in disgust at the failure of aides to read and write and therefore to use the Lakota matrerial at hand, "They have [these] real good books and they don't use 'em."

In spite of this deficiency, one school is boldly requiring the study and use of Lakota by all its elementary teachers, Indian and white alike, regardless of age, nonresidence on the reservation, or previous lack of second language learning experience. At Loneman school, the after-hours study of Lakota at the local branch of the Oglala Sioux Community College is a new phenomenon, since all teachers, even 30-year veterans, are now required to use Lakota in some form or other for 30 minutes a day. (Little Wound school, with its similar 45-minute daily requirement, has less of a remedial task, since 16 of its 17 elementary teachers are native Lakota speakers; it also has a high school teacher of Lakota and English who has an M.A. in linguistics from San Diego State University.) Still, the need for literate teachers and aides is a real one, and the problem is only compounded by the failure of the tribal

[3]While I would hesitate to label the resulting lack of fluency "semilingualism" in the sense used by Skutnabb-Kangas and Toukomaa (1976), the bilingualism achieved in these schools is not yet truly additive (cf. Cummins 1980, 1981); that is, the students' English language skills do not appear to be enriched by virtue of the addition of Lakota instruction. However, standardized testing has yet to be done since the inception of most of the programs surveyed, and judgements of the students' academic language proficiency are therefore premature.

groups to agree on a standard orthography and marking system for a language which has been written down, and then usually only by linguists and missionaries, for little more than a century.

MAINTENANCE OR TRANSITION

It is obvious from the foregoing discussion that the effort to maintain Lakota proficiency is fraught with problems; indeed, more than one educator admitted to me off the record that there is little hope for the survival of Lakota beyond one or two more generations. Saville-Torike's (1978) warning that maintenance bilingual-bicultural programs are the only way to prevent Indian "linguicide" may be true in theory, but such programs must do more than merely foster "Indianness," or "feeling good about oneself," the justification offered for one such program by its director, himself the non-Lakota speaking son of fluent Lakota parents. The language will die too unless it is adapted in grammar and lexicon to fit modern needs; as Grobsmith (1979) has pointed out, its semi-polysynthetic system has already been considerably simplified for "ordinary" use, and twentieth century words like "cancer" have been, and must continue to be, transposed into usable Lakota, despite the fear of some that the sacredness of the language will be violated thereby.

In the meantime, however, all the existing Lakota-English programs are in truth transition programs, since in effect they recognize, by granting only a half hour or more per day to the ancestral language, that English will inevitably be the language of use for virtually all their students. Not even one 50% Lakota/50% English bilingual program exists in the state, much less a total immersion program. In light of this fact, more attention might well be given to the equally acknowledged fact that the English spoken on the reservations, and by many Lakota Sioux off the reservations as well, is a nonstandard variety but one which can be analyzed for its systematic gramatical features; moreover, it can be validated as an old and continuing dialectal form through the collection of contemporary attestations like those appended as well as of recorded historical and folk-literary narratives like those collected by Theisz (1975) and Cash and Hoover (1971). Instruction in Standard English as a Second Dialect, together with Native history and culture courses, might well become the program of first choice for many schools in the light of sch evidence (cf. Spolsky 1982 and Bauman 1980 for discussions of similar alternative options). Assuming the continuation of efforts to "broaden the range of instructional approaches" eligible for inclusion under Title VII guidelines (cf. NCBE *Forum*, Nov.–Dec. 1983, p. 3), and assuming the continued success of efforts to forestall threatened budget cuts in the program (a fingers-crossed assumption, to be sure, in these uncertain times), we may be forced to agree with Marilyn Frank of the Cheyenne River reservation schools at Eagle Butte that the realistic goal of all such programs in the future must be to "acquaint all children with some of the language and culture of another people, to help students with limited English proficiency, and to improve self-esteem through an understanding and knowledge of [Native students'] cultural heritage" (Rapid City *Journal*, Aug. 20, 1982, p. 3).

REFERENCES

Alford, Danny K. 1974. The Cheyenne dialect of English and its educational implications. Unpublished manuscript. Lame Deer, Mont.: Northern Cheyenne Title VII Project.

Allen, T[erry] D. 1982. *Writing to create ourselves: new approaches for teachers, students, and writers*. Norman: Univ. of Oklahoma Press.

Bauman, James J. 1980. *A guide to issues in Indian language retention*. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Bickerton, Derek. 1975. *Dynamics of a creole system: sociolinguistic variables in a creole community in Guyana*. New York: Cambridge Univ. Press.

Blansitt, Edward L., and Richard V. Teschner (Eds.). 1980. *Festschrift for Jacob Ornstein: studies in general linguistics and sociolinguistics*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.

Brown, Roger. 1973. *A first language: the early stages*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press.

Cash, Joseph H., and Herbert T. Hoover (Eds.). 1971. *To be an Indian: an oral history*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

Cronnell, Bruce (Ed.). 1981. *The writing needs of linguistically different students*. Los Alamitos, Calif.: SWRL Educational Research and Development.

Cummins, James. 1980. The construct of language proficiency in bilingual education. *Current issues in bilingual education*. James E. Alatis (Ed.). Washington, D.C.: Georgetown Univ. Press. 81-103.

———. 1981. The role of primary language development in promoting educational success for language minority students. *Schooling and language minority students: a theoretical framework*. California State Dept. of Education, Office of Bilingual Bicultural Education. Los Angeles: California State University, Evaluation, Dissemination and Assessment Center. 3-49.

Dubois, Betty Lou. 1978. A case study of Native American child bidialectalism in English: phonological, morphological and syntactic evidence. *Anthropological Linguistics* 20:1-13.

Fishman, Joshua A. 1980. Bilingual education in the United States under ethnic community auspices. *Current issues in bilingual education*. James E. Alatis (Ed.). Washington, D.C.: Georgetown Univ. Press. 8-13.

Flanigan, Beverly Olson. 1981. American Indian English in history and literature: the evolution of a pidgin from reality to stereotype. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. Bloomington: Indiana University.

———. 1982. Language variation among Native Americans: observations on Lakota English. Paper presented at the Eleventh Annual Conference on New Ways of Analyzing Variation in English (NWAVE XI), Georgetown University, October 21-23, 1982.

Grobsmith, Elizabeth S. 1979. Styles of speaking: an analysis of Lakota communication alternatives. *Anthropological Linguistics* 21, 7:355-361.

Hancock, Ian F. 1977. Lexical expansion within a closed system. *Sociocultural dimensions of language change*. B. G. Blount and Mary Sanches (Eds.). New York: Academic Press.

Harvey, Gina Cantoni. 1974. Dormitory English: implications for the classroom teacher. *Southwest areal linguistics*. Garland Bills (Ed.). San Diego: Institute for Cultural Pluralism.

Leap, William L. 1973. Language pluralism in a Southwestern pueblo: some comments on Isletan English. *Bilingualism in the Southwest*. Paul H. Turner (Ed.). Tucson: Univ. of Arizona Press. 275-293.

———. 1974. On grammaticality in Native American English: the evidence from Isleta. *Linguistics: An International Review*, No. 128:79-89.

———. 1978. American Indian English and its implications for bilingual education. *International dimensions of bilingual education*. James E. Alatis (Ed.). Washington, D.C.: Georgetown Univ. Press. 657-669.

———. 1982. The study of Indian English in the U.S. Southwest: retrospect and prospect. *Bilingualism and language contact: Spanish, English, and Native American languages*. F. Barkin, E. Brandt, and J. Ornstein-Galicia (Eds.). New York: Teachers College Press. 101-119.

——— and Steven Owen Stout. 1976. More on variability in Native American English: Laguna and non-Laguna comparisons. Paper presented at the Fifth Southwestern Language and Linguistics Conference, Trinity University, San Antonio.

Matthews, G[eorge] H. 1976. Bilingual education at Crow Agency. *Studies in Language Learning* 1, 2:265-289.

Miller, Mary Rita. 1977. *Children of the Salt River: first and second language acquisition among Pima children.* Indiana University Language Science Monographs, No. 16. Bloomington: Indiana University.

Nelson-Barber, Sharon S. 1982. Phonologic variations of Pima English. *Language renewal among American Indian tribes: issues, problems, and prospects.* Robert S. Clair and William Leap (Eds.). Rosslyn, Va.: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education. 115-131.

Noll, William. 1980. The mother tongue and early Indian education. Unpublished manuscript. Kyle, S.D.: Little Wound School.

Penfield, Susan. 1975. A grant proposal: suggestions for dealing with Mojave English. *Southwest languages and linguistics in educational perspective.* Gina Harvey and M.F. Heiser (Eds.). San Antonio: Trinity Univ. Press. 335-364.

Potter, Lance D. 1981. American Indian children and writing: an introduction to some issues. *The writing needs of linguistically different students.* Bruce Cronnell (Ed.). Los Alamitos, Calif.: SWRL Educational Research and Development, 129-160.

Public Law 95-561. The educational amendments of 1978. *92 Stat. 2143.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Reinecke, John E. 1969. *Language and dialect in Hawaii: a sociolinguistic history to 1935.* Honolulu: Univ. of Hawaii Press.

Richards, Jack C. 1971. A noncontrastive approach to error analysis. *English Language Teaching* 25:204-219.

Rosier, Paul, and Merilyn Farella. 1976. Bilingual education at Rock Point—some early resuts. *TESOL Quarterly* 10:379-388.

Saville-Troike, Muriel. 1978. Bilingual education and the Native American. *International dimensions of bilingual education.* James E. Alatis (Ed.). Washington, D.C.: Georgetown Univ. Press. 125-132.

Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove, and Pertti Toukomaa. 1976. *Teaching migrant children's mother tongue and learning the language of the host country in the context of the socio-cultural situation of the migrant family.* Helsinki: Finnish National Commission for UNESCO.

Smith, Jeanne. 1981. From the reservation: a call for linguists in the schools. Unpublished manuscript. Kyle, S.D.: Oglala Sioux Community College.

Spolsky, Bernard. 1982. Sociolinguistics of literacy, bilingual education, and Tesol. *TESOL Quarterly* 16, 2:141-151.

St. Clair, Robert, and William Leap. 1982. *Language renewal among American Indian tribes: issues, problems, and prospects.* Rosslyn, Va.: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.

Stout, Steven Owen. 1977. English non-uniformity: a non-adult form of ethnic English. Paper presented at the Sixth Southwestern Language and Linguistics conference. ERIC ED 143 242.

Taylor, Barry P. 1975. The use of overgeneralization and transfer learning strategies by elementary and intermediate students in ESL. *Language Learning* 25:73-107.

Theisz, R[onald] D. (Ed.). 1975. *Buckskin tokens: contemporary oral narratives of the Lakota.* Rosebud, S.D.: Sinte Gleska College.

Troike, Rudolph C. 1978. Research evidence for the effectiveness of bilingual education. *NABE Journal* 3, 1:13-24.

Wax, Murray L., Rosalie H. Wax, and Robert V. Dumont, Jr. 1964. *Formal education in an American Indian community.* Social Problems Monograph No. 1. Kalamazoo, Mich.: The Society for the Study of Social Problems.

Weeks, Thelma E. 1975. The speech of Indian children: paralinguistic and registral aspects of the Yakima dialect. Paper presented at the 65th Annual Meeting of the National Council of Teachers of English, San Diego.

Wolfram, Walt. 1980. Dynamic dimensions of language influence: the case of American Indian English. *Language: social psychological perspectives*. Howard Giles et al. (Eds.). New York: Pergamon Press. 377-388.

——, Donna Christian, William L. Leap, and Lance Potter. 1979. *Variability in the English of two Indian communities and its effect on reading and writing*. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics. ERIC ED 179 108.

APPENDIX

Examples of Lakota English Variation on Rosebud and Pine Ridge Reservations

Phonology

A. (th) variation
1) Dey have dis real good books and dey don' use 'em.
2) So it's real inneresting—tings dose kids should know about.
3) Nort' Dakota, Sout' Dakota (general)

B. (ing) variation
4) Gettin' back to this Indian education.
5) If you speak 'em nothin' but Indian, dey won' unnerstan'.
6) Right now I'm goin' on total physical, like, ah, total immersion.

C. Consonant cluster reduction
7) Dey really soun' funny.
8) When I firs' start' workin' here,
9) I din' realize it's dat hard when I firs' started.
10) Da gues' sit over dere. (pl).
11) We have to stay bilingual all 'e time.
12) Innit good? (isn't it)
13) If M. knew better, she could 'a' walked up to him and said . . .
14) Ol'est might be 'bout five years ol', the younges' t'ree years ol'.
15) I don' tink you could keep any studen's more dan 35 minutes.
16) We're havin' some impack now.

D. Schwa intrusion
17) Oglala /ogəlala/ Sinte Gleska /gəlcška/
18) English /lŋgəllš/ , / ɛŋgəlliš/
19) modern /madɛren/
20) picture /plkəčUr/
21) children /čIldərən/ , /čIldərn/

E. Loss of palatalization
22) Indian /Indən/
23) carry on /kɛr: an/

F. Miscellaneous phonetic realizations

I /a/, my /ma/	dishes /dišəz/
(un) til /tcl/	milk /mclk/
really /riə: li/	finger /flŋer/
regular /rɛgələr/	callers /kalerz/
Missour' River	water /waDer/ , /wad/ , /wa:/

Morphology

A. Lack of S-V agreement
- 24) So when I was teaching the bigger ones that knows how to read and write . . .
- 25) Their childrens, now, they's all speaking English, and that's the one we're tryin' to teach Lakota. . .
- 26) Is there any other stories you remember?
- 27) He don't make 'em anymore.
- 28) My brother, he do that every day.

B. Deletion (or double marking) of plural inflection
- 29) You find some other, two different thing, each one . . .
- 29b) Here is a worksheet, one of the worksheet.
- 30) There's two way of talking.
- 31) Sometimes it's almost 500 dancers, man (pl.) and women together.
- 32) The menfolks on 'e bottom, and 'e middle one is 'e woman (pl.), and the top one is 'e chil'ern.
- 33) One of that word is . . .
- 34) This is all mix-blood childrens.

C. Lack of modifier-noun or noun-referent agreement
- 35) We made most of the things around here—we made it right here.
- 35b) They have this real good books and they don't use 'em.
- 36) They don't have this modern sound systems.
- 37) Their childrens now, they's all speaking English, and that's the one we're trying to teach Lakota.
- 38) They ate every pieces (of candy).

D. Tense shifting
- 39) I had enough of that when I hafta teach in the whole school; we do a lotta writing, reading then.
- 40) So what I done is, I drop the whole high school group.
- 41) So I came back and I stick with the elementary.
- 42) Four years I teach the whole school, you know—I was young . . .

E. *Be/have* auxiliary + uninflected verb of aspect
- 43) Our childrens are start, ya know, really mixing up.
- 44) He got kill here.
- 45) The marshals was just keep shooting at us.

F. Count/noncount variation
- 46) Some of you will probably be faced with additions, or subtractions.
- 47) That's a mathematic in Lakota.
- 48) You want a candy?
- 49) (We ride) much horses.

G. Case and gender variation
- 50) Tell him [her] to get over here.
- 51) He [she] can cash it.
- 52) He said (pointing to his wife) . . .
- 53) Me is here (wall graffitti)

Syntax

A. Deletion of function words and *do* auxiliary
- 54) I color [with] this.
- 55) We like to ride horse.

56) You wanna go bathroom?
57) We have bacon in morning.
58) He go town—he make fire [to] cook.
59) Reagan's gon' cut money we get.
60) They live New York.
61) You use lipstick?
62) Some of 'em, they understand little bit.
62b) What _____ mean?

B. Uninflected (or omitted) *be*
63) They come out and they blind for three weeks.
64) This my grandpa, and my dad.
65) So that's where we goin'.
66) They be goin' home.
67) This room too small to do writing and reading in.
68) What do you suppose values of the Lakota people?
68b) Where you comin' from? Where you goin' now?

C. Existential *it/there* variation
69) Sometimes it's almost 500 dancers, man and women together.

D. Multiple negation
70) We don't have no air conditioning.
71) If nobody don't teach 'em (the language will die).
72) A boy who doesn't know nothin' . . .

E. Inverted sentence order
73) Is that how old is he?
74) You hafta use English (to) tell 'em what's all about.
75) What's he doing there is, he announcing. (declarative)

F. Pronominal apposition (renaming NP/topic)
76) What you read, you must try to remember what you've read.
76b) Mrs. _____, she does the beadwork.
77) Then the afternoon group, they come in.
78) And some of 'em, they knew before.
79) English person, they don't know guttural.
80) I can talk to the students, one of them (one at a time).
81) The parents will, at home, they all speak English.
82) All the neighbor boys, childrens, that he play with, they all speak English.
83) I wonder which language is reversed, the English or the Lakota? Our words are always, the subject always comes first. . . . Especially the day, we come to know the day, we thinking about the kind of day it is.
84) The parents, they all say, they don't, even themselves, don't know how to speak Lakota—some of 'em, they understand little bit. And instead of, their children are learning Lakota. And from the parents, they come and they said, they learn from their children to say Indian words!
85) 'Way back in history dey tell some stories, dese old people, dey tell what's goin' on, to teach da children what's goin' on.
86) On'y thing different among us in dis Sou' Dakota bands, different reservations, we're all Siouxs and we speak da same language, but—da on'y difference is dialect.